

A Corpus-based Comparative Study of Literary Translation Styles: Taking the C-E Translations of the 11th “The World of English Cup” Translation Contest as an Example

Zheng Jie, Associate Professor
Xiong Lingsong, Master’s Student
Luo Ruifeng, Professor

Zheng Jie, Postdoctor, Associate Professor in Linguistics & Cognitive Translation, Sichuan International Studies University, Chongqing 400031, China. Xiong Lingsong, Master’s Student in Translation, College of Foreign Languages, Chongqing Medical University, Chongqing 400331, China. Luo Ruifeng, Professor in Linguistics & Translation, College of Foreign Languages, Chongqing Medical University, Chongqing 400331, China. Correspondence: Xiong Lingsong: 2020121939@stu.cqmu.edu.cn; Luo Ruifeng: 103018@cqmu.edu.cn.

Abstract: The paper makes a qualitative and quantitative analysis of the translation style differences between the reference translation (Lin’s Version) and the first prize-winning translation (Liu’s Version) of *The Original Mission of Culture* in the “11th Hangzhou Normal University-English World Cup Translation Contest” from lexical, syntactic and discourse features. The translation styles of the two translators are found to show similarities and differences. The differences are mainly reflected in the lexical and sentence dimensions. Lin’s Version shows higher lexical richness and complexity and sophisticated sentence patterns, while Liu’s Version is more reader-friendly, featured by changing narrative perspectives, adopting the explicit translation method, and reflecting the explanatory trend. The similarities are mainly embodied in discourse features. Both translation versions use conjunctions to achieve discourse cohesion with similar effects. But given lexicon, syntax, and other factors, Liu’s Version is better in readability. The main causes for the different translation styles of the two versions are related to the translator’s identity and professional background, as well as the translator’s emotional orientation towards the contest.

Key words: corpus; literary translation; translation style
Tob Regul Sci.™ 2021;7(6): 5977-5987
DOI: doi.org/10.18001/TRS.7.6.77

Corpus-based translation studies, guided by linguistic theories, adopt probabilistic and statistical methods to conduct diachronic or synchronic research on translation with authentic bilingual corpora as the research object.¹

Professor Mona Baker of the University of Manchester, UK, was the first to integrate corpus techniques and methods into the field of translation studies, affirming the feasibility and necessity of the integration.² Literary translation criticism includes the evaluation and analysis of literary translation works

and processes, as well as literary translators themselves, all of which are based on specific translation criteria and theories. However, most of the previous studies on literary translation criticism are qualitative studies, which rely on personal subjective judgment for literary translation. The research conclusions are primarily subjective and one-sided. With the corpus method incorporated, corpus-based literary translation criticism research involves analyzing and evaluating the translation quality, rationality of the translation process, translator's translation thoughts, and styles of literary translation work. From qualitative and quantitative perspectives, the analysis and evaluation focus on lexicon, syntax, semantics, and discourse, based on the description of the phenomenon and process of literary translation according to specific translation standards or translation theories. Such research reflects the advantages of objective, scientific, and comprehensive nature of corpus technology.³ At present, corpus translation studies in China mainly include corpus construction and technology, translation language features, translation norms, translation styles, translation education, translation strategies and methods, translation cognition, and lexicography.⁴

Translation style is defined as the individual characteristics of the translator in the selection of the translated text and the application of translation strategies and methods, mainly featured by stability, variability, uniqueness, and systematicness. The study of the translator's style is mainly carried out from the linguistic and non-linguistic feature levels. The study of translator's style on linguistic features should be considered from lexicon, syntax, collocation, semantic charm, discourse, and narrative features, while the one on non-linguistic features should be carried out from translation strategies and methods. Corpus-based studies of translators' styles are carried out through the construction of corpora of translated texts, statistical analysis, description of translation phenomena, induction of translators' style features, and interpretation of the translation phenomena. At present, corpus-

based studies of translators' styles have progressed in lexical application, syntactic structure, narrative features, and translation strategies and methods.⁵

At present, the research objects of translation style in corpus translation in China are dominated by Chinese-English translations of literary classics such as *A Dream of Red Mansions*, *Analects of Confucius*, and *Classic of History*, novels represented by Lu Xun's, essays such as *Rush*, as well as English-Chinese translations of novels and essays such as *Walden* and *The Great Gatsby*, and Shakespeare's plays. Although scholars have commented on the reference translations of the annual Han Suyin International Translation Contest, a comparative analysis of the participating translations still lacks, failing to provide practical learning guidance for contestants. Some scholars have compared the advantages and disadvantages of artificial translation, reference translation, and machine translation. For example, Yang and Jia⁶ took the source text of the 30th Han Suyin International Translation Contest, machine translation by Microsoft, artificial translation and reference translation as a corpus, established error type standards from the perspectives of the lexicon, grammar, and syntax, and discussed the coherence and logic of the machine translation by Microsoft from the perspective of discourse. However, there are still few comparative studies on the translation between the reference translation and the award-winning translations in China. Therefore, the research scope of corpus-based translation style research needs to be expanded. A comparative study of the reference translation and the winning translations in translation contests is beneficial for translation learners to clarify the differences between English and Chinese languages, enhance language aesthetics and approach the ideal translation, which is rich in great theoretical and practical significance.

This study takes the source text, the Chinese-English reference translation (Lin Wei's translation, hereinafter referred to as “Lin's Version”) and the first prize-winning translation (Liu Xiangyang's translation, hereinafter referred to as “Liu's Version”) in the “11th Hangzhou Normal University-English World Cup Translation Contest” as the research objects. This paper focuses on the different translation methods of Lin and Liu, investigates the differences

in translation styles between Chinese and English versions from qualitative and quantitative perspectives, and tries to interpret the reasons behind translation phenomena. This paper intends to answer the following research questions:

(1) What are the differences between Lin’s Version and Liu’s Version from the perspective of lexical, syntactic, and discourse features?

(2) What are the translation styles of Lin’s Version and Liu’s Version?

(3) What are the causes of Lin’s and Liu’s translation styles?

RESEARCH OBJECTS AND METHODS

Research Objects

The corpus selected in this study includes the source text of the Chinese-English Translations of the 11th “The World of English Cup” Translation Contest, the reference translation (by Lin Wei), and the first prize-winning translation (by Liu Xiangyang). The research objects of this paper are Lin’s Version and Liu’s Version. In the Chinese-English parallel corpus, Lin’s Version and Liu’s Version constitute two small comparable sub-corpora.

“*The Original Mission of Culture*,” the C-E source text of the 11th “The World of English Cup” Translation Contest, is excerpted from “All Cultures Eventually Precipitate into Personality,” an article published on Sohu.com on August 6, 2018, and the title and subsection marks of the source text are added by the organizing committee of the contest.

Dr. Lin Wei, translator of reference translation (*The Primary Mission of Culture*), is a distinguished professor of Jinan University, an expert in Chinese-Japanese-English translation, an editorial board member of *English World*, and a judge of Han Suyin Translation Contest. He began to learn foreign languages at an early age and mastered English and Japanese. Lin has lived and studied abroad for decades and published many translated works, especially famous for his “self-writing and self-translating” Chinese-English translation.

Liu Xiangyang, translator of the first prize-winning version (*The Original Mission of Culture*), works for SAP (China) Co., Ltd. as an in-house translator. He has participated in many translation contests and won the second prize of the English-Chinese Translation Group of the 4th Xu Yuanchong Translation Contest and the excellence prize of the English Group of the 17th “Shanghai Translation” Cup Translation Contest.

Research Methods

In this study, WordSmith 8.0 is used for corpus retrieval and comparative analysis, and BFSU HugeMind Readability Analyzer 2.0 is adopted for comparative readability analysis. The paper compares the differences in translation styles between the two versions from lexical features (such as standardized type/token ratio, mean word length, and culture-loaded information), syntactic features (such as mean sentence length and number ratio of target/source sentences), and discourse features (such as cohesive devices and readability index). This paper also intends to interpret the causes of the differences in translation styles considering the translators’ backgrounds.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Lexical Feature Analysis

Standardized type/token ratio (STTR)

Types refer to the number of different words in the corpus, and tokens refer to the total number of words. It is insufficient to reflect the essential text features from the comparative analysis of the numbers of types and tokens. Still, the type/token ratio (TTR) can reflect some essential features of the text, such as the diversity of words. The higher the TTR, the higher the lexical richness, which means that the more flexible and rich the lexicon is used.⁷ However, TTR cannot objectively reflect the richness of words among corpora with different storages, so the academic circles generally use standardized type/token ratio (STTR) to eliminate the errors caused by the high frequency of function words to measure lexical changes. According to WordSmith statistics, the STTR figures of the two versions are shown in Table 1.

Table 1
Types, Tokens, and STTR of Lin’s Version and Liu’s Version

	Lin’s Version	Liu’s Version
Types	246	280
Tokens	370	470
Standardized type/token ratio (STTR)	66.49%	59.57%

By comparison, it can be found that the numbers of types and tokens in Liu’s Version are both higher than those in Lin’s Version, revealing that Liu adopts the translation method of adding based on understanding the source text. However, from the perspective of STTR, Lin’s Version (66.49%) is higher than Liu’s Version (59.57%), which indicates that Lin’s Version has higher lexical richness and Liu’s Version reflects more frequent lexical repetition, as in Example 1.

Example 1

ST: *Shi jie shang bu tong wen hua qun luo zhi jian de ge he yu gou tong, ye shi yi shi fou hu xiang shen ru wen hua xian chang wei qi ji. Xuan zang dao yin du qu jing, kan si zhe yan yu fo jing wen ben, shi ji shang geng zhong yao de shi shen ru fo jiao fa sheng di zhe me yi ge zhong yao de wen hua xian chang, zhe shi quan bu fo jiao wen ben dou ju bei le chong zu de mu ti yi ju.* (100 characters)

Lin’s Version: The effectiveness of cross-cultural communication between communities in the world may also be enhanced by **being each other’s cultural sites**. Xuanzang (602-664), for instance, went on a **pilgrimage** to India for **Buddhist sutras**, implying much more profound meanings than simply learning the texts; his was **an exploration into** the cradle of Buddhism. The **journey** itself sufficiently substantialized the **scriptures**. (60 words)

Liu’s Version: Cultural communities around the world may feel estranged towards each other or they may interact with each other, depending on whether or not they **maintain a strong presence in one another’s cultural locale**. **Buddhist scriptures** may seem to have driven Xuan Zang’s **odyssey** to India, but what turned out more important is that he **established a powerful presence in a crucial cultural locale**

– the origin of Buddhism. **Such inalienable links** with its place of birth, therefore, become part of the entire **scripture text**. (83 words)

In the last sentence of the ST in Example 1, Liu adds “Such inalienable links,” the information that did not appear in the ST, serving as a cohesive device added by the translator to achieve semantic coherence between sentences based on understanding the ST.

In the ST, “*wen hua xian chang*” appears twice. Lin translates it into “cultural sites,” and it only appears once. When dealing with the second “*wen hua xian chang*” in the sentence “*fo jiao fa sheng di zhe me yi ge zhong yao de wen hua xian chang*,” Lin combines “*fo jiao fa sheng di*” with “*wen hua xian chang*.” The translator may consider that the more dominant word that conveys the main message in this phrase is “*fo jiao fashengdi*,” so Lin only translates it into “cultural sites” and omits “cultural scene,” thus reducing lexical repetition. Liu translated it into “cultural locale” at two corresponding positions, thus improving the lexical repetition.

When translating “*shen ru wen hua xian chang*” and “*shen ru ... wen hua xian chang*,” Lin uses “being each other’s cultural sites” and “an exploration into” respectively, reflecting the richness of vocabulary from the perspective of phrase diversity. However, Liu adopts “maintain a strong presence in one another cultural locale” and “established a powerful presence in a crucial cultural locale,” both of which use the word “presence,” revealing the lexical repetition of Liu’s translation.

Regarding “*qu jing*,” Lin translates it as “a pilgrimage (to India) for Buddhist sutras,” and in the last sentence, Lin redirects the reference of “this” to “journey,” reflecting its vocabulary richness, while Liu only uses “odyssey to India.”

Synonyms such as “*fo jing wen ben* (Buddhist scripture text)” and “*fo jiao wen ben* (Buddhist text)” appear twice in the ST. Lin translates them into

“Buddhist sutras” and “scriptures” respectively, improving the lexical richness, while Liu uses “Buddhist scriptures” and “scripture text,” still showing the lexical repetition in his translation.

Through qualitative and quantitative comparison, it is found that Lin’s choice of lexical structure is diversified in terms of synonyms in the original text, and the STTR is high, indicating that Lin’s Version has high lexical richness. Liu tends to use the same vocabulary to achieve semantic cohesion, but the vocabulary repetition is high with a tendency for adding, which leads to high type and token figures.

Mean Word Length

Mean word length refers to the average length of all words in the text, and its unit is the number of letters. The longer the mean word length is, the longer the words are presented in the text. The mean word length of ordinary texts is generally

about 4 letters. If the mean word length is less than 4 letters, it reflects that the words used in the text are relatively simple; If it is higher than 4 letters, it indicates that the words used in the text are more complicated. Therefore, the mean word length can reflect the lexical complexity. The mean word length of English texts is generally 2-6 letters.⁸

According to WordSmith’s statistics, the mean word length of Lin’s Version is 5.34, and that of Liu’s is 5.00. This shows that the mean word length of the two versions is very close, and there is not much difference in overall word use difficulty. WordSmith can also count the frequency of words of different lengths. Because the storages of the two versions are different, the frequency of words of different lengths is not comparable. Therefore, in order to achieve the comparability and objectivity of each word length and frequency in the two versions, this paper calculates the ratio of the frequency of each word length to the total number of words in the text, and the results are shown in Table 2:

Word length	Lin’s Version		Liu’s Version	
	Word frequency/times	Percentage (%)	Word frequency/times	Percentage (%)
1-letter words	7	1.88	18	3.82
2-letter words	49	13.14	77	16.35
3-letter words	66	17.69	82	17.41
4-letter words	57	15.28	79	16.77
5-letter words	40	10.72	49	10.40
6-letter words	33	8.85	36	7.64
7-letter words	42	11.26	33	7.01
8-letter words	26	6.97	37	7.86
9-letter words	21	5.63	20	4.25
10-letter words	6	1.61	16	3.40
11-letter words	11	2.95	8	1.70
12-letter words	7	1.88	6	1.27
13-letter words	5	1.34	8	1.70
14-letter words	2	0.54	0	0.00
15-letter words	1	0.27	2	0.42
7(+)-letter words	121	32.44	130	27.60
Total	373		471	

In Table 2, the proportion of words with a length of three letters in the two versions is the highest, with Lin’s Version being 17.69% and Liu’s Version being 17.41%. The frequency of words with a length of more than or equal to 7 letters is counted. The proportion of Lin’s Version (32.44%) is greater than that of Liu’s

Version (27.60%), indicating that the words used in Lin’s Version are more complex, as shown in Example 2.

Example 2

ST:wen hua ren de zhe zuo, yan shuo you nu li fu ping zhe she hui zao dong de shen jing, shi zhi an

ding.

Lin’s Version: ... They spare no **efforts** to smooth the **popular** mood, calm social nerves and **tranquilize communities**. (15 words)

Liu’s Version: ... they seek to soothe the **restless** and **agitated society** with their books and **lectures**. (14 words)

In Lin’s Version, there are two 7-letter words and two 11-letter words, and the average length of words greater than or equal to 7 letters is 9 letters. In Liu’s Version, there is one 7-letter word and three 8-letter words in, and the average length of words greater than or equal to 7 letters is 7.75 letters. Therefore, the lexicon in Lin’s Version is more complicated in Example 2.

When dealing with the verbs of “*Fu ping* (smoothing)” and “*An ding* (stabilizing)”, Lin adopts three synonyms, i.e. “smooth”, “calm” and “tranquilize”, among which “tranquilize” is the longest with 11 letters, while Liu’s Version includes only one word, i.e., “soothe,” avoiding the redundancy of synonyms. When dealing with the noun “*she hui* (society)” Lin uses the adjectives “popular” and “social” and the plural noun “communities,” while Liu only translates it into “society,” which is lower in word length, making the language concise and lower in lexical complexity.

Culture-Loaded Information

Culture-loaded words refer to words with certain cultural backgrounds or profound cultural implications, such as allusions, names of specific characters, idioms, idioms, and proverbs.⁹ Therefore, the cultural connotation carriers of the unique words in the source language, such as names of people and Chinese poems, are essential to enrich the study of the translator’s style regarding non-linguistic features.

According to the general translation strategy of names, the corresponding names and existing translated names in the target language are the first options to adopt, followed by transcoding according to the rules. The transcoding rules of name translation are mainly divided into several schemes: keeping the original form, form transcoding, phonetic transcoding, and third-party rule of transcoding. Among them, pronunciation transcoding and third-party rule of transcoding are suitable for translating names between Chinese and English. In translating foreign and Chinese names, phonetic transcoding can be conducted with the World Names Dictionary (Chinese Edition) to ensure standardization. In the translation of Chinese names into languages based on Roman letters, the third-party rules of the Chinese Pinyin system can be used for transcoding.¹⁰ After searching, there are two names in the ST: “*Xuan Zang*” and “*Ma Ga Er Ni*,” and the translations by Lin and Liu are presented in Table 3.

	Lin’s Version	Liu’s Version
Xuan Zang	Xuanzang (602-664)	Xuan Zang
Ma Ga Er Ni	the English George Macartney	George Macartney, first British emissary to China

As shown in Table 3, Liu and Lin both adopt transliteration in handling Xuanzang’s name. But Lin’s version shows a more mature approach to translating it into “Xuanzang (602-664)”, where the years of his birth and death are added after the name in brackets. Liu divides Xuanzang’s name into two words, “Xuan Zang,” where both words have capitalized initials. In dealing with the names of *Ma Ga Er Ni*, Liu’s Version is more friendly to readers with weak historical

background knowledge. Liu uses appositive structure to supplement the position of this historical figure, and *Ma Ga Er Ni* is translated as “George Macartney, first British emissary to China.” Lin’s Version is relatively simple with the translation of “the English George Macartney.”

Overall, in dealing with such culture-loaded information as names of people, Lin’s translation approach is relatively mature, while Liu’s Version is more reader-friendly with supplementary appropriate

background information.

In the translation of ancient Chinese poetry, fuzzy equivalence translation can convey the beauty of fuzziness in the source literary works. By this approach, vague words are translated in one language into another, or vague concepts are delivered with a word in one language.¹¹ A Chinese poem sentence “*Hai ke tan ying zhou*” in the ST is translated by Lin and Liu as shown in Example 3:

Example 3

ST: ... *er zhong guo fang mian, dui ou zhou de le jie ze zhang qi chu yu “hai ke tan ying zhou” de zhuang tai ...*

Lin’s Version: On the other hand, having indulged in **talking only about alien legends**, the Chinese barely had any knowledge about their counterparts except ludicrous conjectures ...

Liu’s Version: On the contrary, **hearsay** had long been a source of information for China to learn about Europe.

“*Hai ke tan ying zhou*” comes from the Tang Dynasty poet Li Bai’s *A Visit to Sky-Mother Mountain in a Dream*. “*Hai ke*” refers to “sailors” or “people who roam all over the world,” and “*ying zhou*” is a legendary mountain in the sea.

“*Hai ke tan ying zhou*” is used as a metaphor for Chinese people’s misunderstanding of Europe, which is only hearsay, implying the information is not necessarily complete, accurate, or credible. Lin translates it as “talking only about alien legends,” while Liu only uses “hearsay.” From the perspective of translation strategy, both adopt domestication strategy, without stiffly translating

“*hai ke*” into an English character noun, keeping the transliteration of “*ying zhou*,” or annotating it as a legendary mountain on the sea. The translation indicates that both translators adopt domestication as a translation strategy, making the translation closer to the target language. From the perspective of translation methods, Lin adopts deletion by omitting the subject component of “*hai ke*” in the poem and combining it with the subject of “Chinese” in the translation, which only conveys the information of “talking only about alien legends.” The original information transmission is relatively complete. Liu adopts the translation method to make the target text more explicit by translating the real meaning of “*hai ke tan ying zhou*” into the word “hearsay.” Although the original information transmission is incomplete, the language effect of information transmission can be achieved through fuzzy equivalent translation.

Syntactic Feature Analysis

Mean sentence length and number of sentences

Mean sentence length is the average length of all sentences in the text, and the unit is the number of words. The length of a sentence reflects the complexity of a sentence to a certain extent. Generally speaking, the longer the mean sentence length is, the more complex the syntactic structure of the text is, and the more difficult it is to understand the sentence.¹² Sentences can be divided into three types according to their length: short sentences with 1-9 words, medium sentences with 10-25 words, and long sentences with more than 25 words.¹³ According to WordSmith statistics, the number of sentences, mean sentence length, the standard deviation of sentences, and the ratio of ST/TT sentence number are shown in Table 4:

	Lin’s Version	Liu’s Version
Number of sentences	17	20
Mean sentence length	21.76	23.50
Standard deviation of sentences	10.97	11.80
Number ratio of target/source sentences (11 source sentences)	1.55: 1	1.82: 1

It can be seen from Table 4 that the number of sentences translated by Lin and Liu exceeds the

number of sentences in the ST (11 sentences), which indicates the tendency to make information more

evident in the target texts. However, compared with Lin’s Version, Liu’s Version has more sentences, and the mean sentence length and the number ratio of target/source sentences are more significant, which shows that Liu’s Version is more complex and has more complex sentences, revealing the trend of Liu’s Version for interpretation.

Number of Sentence Patterns

By searching the periods and question marks in the text, Table 5 lists the number of declarative sentences and rhetorical questions in the ST, Lin’s Version, and Liu’s Version:

	ST	Lin’s Version	Liu’s Version
Declarative sentence	10	16	20
Rhetorical question	1	1	0

As seen from Table 5, Lin retains the only interrogative sentence pattern in the ST, while Liu changes the interrogative sentence pattern into a declarative sentence pattern. See Example 4 for an explanation.

Example 4

ST: *Bu guan shi dong fang hai shi xi fang, na yi ge zhen zheng de da wen hua ren bu shi wei le ren lei de he ping, you hao er dong ben xi zou, si chu you shuo de? shi shi huang luan, wen hua ren de xue yuan, jiang tan yi ci ci gou jian zhe you ke neng de he xie; ren xin fu dong, wen hua ren de zhe zuo. yan shuo you nu li fu ping zhe she hui zao dong de shen jing, shi zhi an ding.* (100 characters)

Lin’s Version: As a matter of facts, why in the East or West, **isn’t it true that** all great intellects, everything they go, especially in times of turmoil and chaos, always reach peace and harmony in their speeches, lectures and writings? They spare no efforts to smooth the popular mood, calm social nerves and tranquilize communities. (54 words)

Liu’s Version: **We have yet to see** a really influenced intellectual, in both East and West, **who doesn’t** go out of his way and brave fatigue and hardships to champion peace and friendship of humankind. Amid a complexity of world

affairs, intellects use forums and podiums to build conceived Harmony; With our minds Becoming incrementally unsettled, they seek to soothe the restless and agitated society with their books and lectures. (68 words)

Example 4 shows the different narrative features embodied in Lin’s Version and Liu’s Version. Dealing with the sentence pattern “*Na yi ge ... bu shi ... de?* (which one... is not...?)”, Lin retains the rhetorical question pattern and uses the sentence pattern of “isn’t it true that ...?” to convey the rhetorical question tone. However, Liu adds the personal pronoun of “we,” with the narrative perspective changed, to state the objective facts from the first-person perspective. The sentence pattern of “We have yet to see ... who doesn’t...” is adopted. Although the message is consistent, it fails to keep consistent with the ST style, weakening the tone.

Discourse Feature Analysis

Cohesive devices

The analysis of discourse features cannot be separated from the study of cohesive devices, and conjunctions are the focus of discourse cohesion and coherence. According to WordSmith statistics, the frequency and percentage of conjunctions used in Lin’s Version and Liu’s Version are shown in the following table:

Lin’s Version	Liu’s Version
---------------	---------------

Conjunctions	Word frequency/times	Percentage (%)	Word frequency/times	Percentage (%)
and	14	3.73	15	3.16
when	2	0.53	2	0.42
or	2	0.53	3	0.63
however	1	0.27	0	0.00
but	0	0.00	3	0.63
while	0	0.00	1	0.21
therefore	0	0.00	1	0.21
Total	19	5.06	25	5.26

It can be seen from Table 6 that the percentage of conjunctions in Lin’s Version is 5.06%, while that in Liu’s Version is 5.26%, showing no significant difference. But what they have in common is that both versions archive textual cohesion by adding conjunctions, highlighting the implicit logical relationship in the Chinese source text, which accords with the hypotaxis feature of English, the target language. For example:

Example 5

ST: *Wen hua ren ye you zheng lun, zheng lun de zui zhong gui xiang ye wu fei shi yong he zhong fang fa cai neng geng you xiao di shi she hui he xie he an ding. Zhi dao er shi yi shi ji, wen hua de zhi gao ceng ci dou reng ran shi ru ci.* (61 characters)

Lin’s Version: **Certainly** there are controversies among different cultures’ advocates. The goal of their debates, **however**, is nothing more than searching for better ways to achieve social harmony and stability, which has always been the ultimate objective of culture even in today’s twenty-first Century. (42 words)

Liu’s Version: Contentions among intellectuals are not rare, **for sure**, **but** they eventually boil down to the question of finding the more effective approach to building a stable and harmonious society. Even in the 21st century, this still rings true among the supreme of our cultures. (44 words)

In Example 5, both versions add adversatives to achieve logical cohesion and coherence in the translation of “*ye wu fei shi*” and highlight the transitional logic implied in the Chinese source text. Lin puts “however” in the middle of the sentence as a parenthesis to form transition, while Liu puts “but” at the beginning of the second half of the sentence to form transition.

Meanwhile, with regards to the first sentence “*wen hua ren ye you zheng lun* (intellectuals also have arguments),” both translators are aware of the cohesion and coherence between paragraphs and use adverbs or modal particles to supplement the tone. For example, Lin Yi adds “certainly” to inherit the tone, while Liu adds “for sure” at the end of the first sentence to highlight the implied tone components. Both versions address the cohesion and coherence of the text.

Readability Indexes

The commonly used formulas for calculating the readability of English texts are Flesch Reading Ease Score and Flesch-Kincaid Reading Grade Level. The scale Flesch Reading Ease Score range from 100 to 0, indicating the levels from easy to difficult. Flesch Reading Ease Score is based on the classification of American school grades, and the score indicates the difficulty that students in the corresponding grade can understand.¹⁴ To avoid accidental deviation, this paper uses BFSU Huge Mind Readability Analyzer 2.0 to calculate readability for the two versions. The comparative data are as follows:

Formula	Lin’s Version	Liu’s Version
Flesch Reading Ease Score	34.78	39.19
Flesh-Kincaid Grade Level	12.95	13.06

As can be seen from Table 7, there is little difference between the two readability scores according to Flesch Reading Ease Score, indicating the difficulty that the 13th graders in the United States can understand. However, Liu's Version has a higher readability index, revealing that Liu's Version is easier to understand and more readable.

ANALYSIS OF THE CAUSES FOR TRANSLATION STYLES

Through corpus translation studies, this study makes a qualitative and quantitative comparative study on the differences of translation styles between Lin's Version and Liu's Version from lexical, syntactic, and discourse features.

From the dimension of lexical features, Lin's Version is richer in lexicon, and Liu's Version is more repetitive in words. The lexicon in Lin's Version is more complicated. In processing such culture-loaded information as names, Lin's translation is relatively mature, while Liu properly supplements background information to facilitate readers' understanding; In translating Chinese poetry, both translators adopt domestication as a translation strategy, in which Lin adopts deletion and Liu adopts the explicit translation approach.

From the dimension of syntactic features, the sentence patterns in Liu's Version are more complicated with more complex sentences, which reveals the interpretation tendency of Liu's Version; In terms of the language style of sentence patterns, Lin's Version and Liu's Version embody two different narrative features. Lin tends to retain particular sentence patterns, while Liu is intended to change narrative perspectives and transform special sentence patterns.

From the perspective of discourse features, both versions realize the critical role of conjunctions in achieving discourse cohesion, and both highlight the implicit logic in the Chinese source text. In terms of the readability index, Liu's Version is easier to understand and more readable.

Based on the background information of the translator's identity collected by the author, this study analyzes the causes of the different translation styles of Lin and Liu as follows:

First, the identity and professional backgrounds of translators are different. Dr. Lin Wei is a distinguished professor of Jinan University. He has contributed to English World for a long time and published many excellent translation works. He is famous for his “self-writing and self-translating” Chinese-English translation. He has been in an academic environment for a long time and has enough time to engage in literary translation. Liu Xiangyang, an English translator, works for SAP (China) Co., Ltd. He has been rooted in market translation for a long time and is more aware of being reader-friendly. Therefore, through the analysis and comparison of the two versions, Liu's Version is more readable and friendly to readers.

Secondly, the emotional orientation of translators towards contests is different. Dr. Lin Wei and “English World” share a close relationship. Lin contributes to this contest with a reference translation, without the pressure of winning awards. Therefore, he is given greater autonomy in processing the text, and he dares to display his abilities in lexical diversity and complexity. However, as a contestant, Liu Xiangyang is intended to address the scoring needs, trying to write clearly and avoid the ambiguity brought by using “big words.” Therefore, through the analysis and comparison of the two versions, Liu's Version shows an interpretation tendency with the explicit translation method.

CONCLUSION

The study compares the differences in translation styles between the two versions quantitatively and qualitatively, from lexical features (such as standardized type/token ratio, mean word length, and culture-loaded information), syntactic features (such as mean sentence length and number ratio of target/source sentences), and discourse features (such as cohesive devices and readability index). The translation styles of the two translators are found to show similarities and differences. The differences are mainly reflected in the lexical and syntactic dimensions. Lin's Version shows higher lexical

richness and complexity as well as a more significant proportion of sophisticated sentences. Liu’s Version is more reader-friendly, featured by changing narrative perspectives, adopting the explicit translation method, and reflecting an explanatory trend. The similarities are mainly embodied in discourse features. Both translation versions use conjunctions to achieve discourse cohesion with similar effects. But given vocabulary, sentences, and other factors, Liu’s version is better in readability. The main causes of the different translation styles of the two versions are related to the translators’ identity and professional background, as well as the translators’ emotional orientation towards the contest.

Conflicts of Interest Disclosure Statement

The authors declare no conflict of interest in the authorship or publication of this work. The authors declare no sponsored financial sources for the undertaken study.

Acknowledgement

This research is funded by Project of Humanities and social sciences of Chongqing Municipal Commission of Education (NO.21SKGH037).

References

1. Wang KF. A New Research Paradigm of Corpus Translation Studies. *Foreign Languages in China*. 2006;(03): 8-9.
doi: CNKI:SUN:ZGWE.0.2006-03-005.
2. Snell-Hornby M. The Turns of Translation Studies: New paradigms or shifting viewpoints? John Benjamins Publishing. 2006.
doi: 10.1075/hts.1.the1
3. Hu KB, Sheng DD. Corpus-based Literary Translation Criticism Research: Connotation, Meaning and Future. *Technology Enhanced Foreign Language Education*. 2020;(05): 19-24+3.
doi: CNKI:SUN:WYDH.0.2020-05-002.
4. Fu LL, Mu L. Corpus Translation Studies: Between Name and Reality. *Foreign Language Research*. 2020;(01):75-83.
doi: 10.16263/j.cnki.23-1071/h.2020.01.011
5. Hu KB, Xie LX. A Corpus-based Study of Translator Style: Connotations and Paths. *Chinese Translators Journal*. 2017;38(02):12-8+128.
doi: CNKI:SUN:ZGFY.0.2017-02-003.
6. Yang M, Jia F. Errors in Coherence and Logic Embodied in the Microsoft Machine Translation Text-Based on the corpus of the Chinese-English translation texts taken from the 30th Han Suyin International Translation Contest; proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Humanities Science and Society Development, Xiamen, Fujian, China, F, 2019.
doi: 10.2991/ichssd-19.2019.10
7. Baker M. A corpus-based view of similarity and difference in translation. *International journal of corpus linguistics*. 2004;9(2):167-93.
doi: 10.1075/ijcl.9.2.02bak
8. Chen JS, Gao B. A Corpus-based Study of the Translator's Style in Two English Translations of The Book of Ancient Poetry: Taking National Wind as an Example. *Journal of Tianjin Foreign Studies University*. 2011;8(04):36-41.
doi: CNKI:SUN:TJWG.0.2011-04-006.
9. Fang MZ. A Dictionary of Translation Studies. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press. 2004.
10. Luo CW. Translation Strategies and Basis of Names of People. *Foreign Languages Research*. 2014;(02):77-81.
doi: 10.13978/j.cnki.wyyj.2014.02.019.
11. Li XQ, Chen D. Translation Studies on Chinese Ancient Poetry. *Language Planning*. 2014;(08):68.
doi:10.16412/j.cnki.1001-8476.2014.08.042.
12. Yang HZ, Wei NX. An Introduction to Corpus Linguistics. Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, 2002.
13. Butler C. Statistics in linguistics. B. Blackwell, 1985.
doi: 10.1016/0346-251X(88)90020-6
14. Yao GS. Readability Testing of English Passages. *Nei Jiang Ke Ji*. 2008;(11):28 + 7.
doi: CNKI:SUN:KJNJ.0.2008-11-02